



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,369	07/12/2006	Takashi Sasabayashi	3408.73910	7981
24978	7590	09/23/2010		
GREER, BURNS & CRAIN 300 S WACKER DR 25TH FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606				
EXAMINER				
MERLIN, JESSICA M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2871				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/23/2010		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/550,369

**Applicant(s)**

SASABAYASHI, TAKASHI

**Examiner**

JESSICA M. MERLIN

**Art Unit**

2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 July 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8 and 9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8 and 9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 September 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-840)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### Response to Amendment

1. Receipt is acknowledged of applicant's amendment filed July 13, 2010. Claims 7 and 10-18 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1-6, 8 and 9 are pending and an action on the merits is as follows.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1-6, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andry et al. (U.S. 6,724,449 B1) in view of Suzuki et al. (U.S. 2002/0080320 A1).**

In regard to claim 1, Andry et al. discloses a liquid crystal display device comprising a liquid crystal layer **Liquid Crystal** and a pair of electrodes **ITO, ITO Layer** for applying voltage onto the liquid crystal installed on both sides of said liquid crystal layer **Liquid Crystal**, the liquid crystal layer **Liquid Crystal** and pair of electrodes **ITO, ITO Layer** being sandwiched by a pair of substrates **Glass, Glass**, wherein (see e.g. Figures 4-6):

said liquid crystal layer has a section **401** obtained by polymerizing a polymerizable compound in the presence of said liquid crystal through selective irradiation of active energy rays over the substrate surface;

a section or sections **401** (alignment direction controlling section or sections) that show an effect to control the alignment directions caused by a polymerized liquid crystal composition obtained by the selective irradiation of active energy rays are installed on either one of the surfaces only which contact the liquid crystal layer (liquid crystal layer contacting surfaces), or each independently on both of the surfaces wherein none of the section or sections contact both substrates.

Note that the product by process limitations, “obtained by polymerizing a polymerizable compound in the presence of said liquid crystal through selective irradiation of active energy rays over the substrate surface” and “caused by a polymerized liquid crystal composition obtained by the selective irradiation of active energy rays” has been fully considered by the examiner. However, it is further noted that the patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production (see e.g. MPEP 2113).

Andry et al. is silent as to

a first polarizer and a second polarizer are installed each on one of the outer sides of said pair of substrates so that the absorption axes of the two polarizers are perpendicular to each other;

a first 1/4 wavelength plate is installed between one of said substrates and the first polarizer;

a second 1/4 wavelength plate is installed between the other one of said substrates and the second polarizer; and

the absorption axis of the first polarizer is at  $45^\circ$  from the phase delay axis of the first 1/4 wavelength plate, the absorption axis of the second polarizer is at  $45^\circ$  from the phase delay axis

of the second  $1/4$  wavelength plate, and the phase delay axis of the first  $1/4$  wavelength plate and the phase delay axis of the second  $1/4$  wavelength plate are perpendicular to each other.

However, Suzuki et al. discloses

a first polarizer **720** and a second polarizer **720** are installed each on one of the outer sides of said pair of substrates **701**, **707** so that the absorption axes of the two polarizers are perpendicular to each other (see e.g. paragraph [0070]);

a first  $1/4$  wavelength plate **721** is installed between one of said substrates **701** and the first polarizer **720**;

a second  $1/4$  wavelength plate **721** is installed between the other one of said substrates **707** and the second polarizer **720**; and

the absorption axis of the first polarizer **720** is at  $45^\circ$  from the phase delay axis of the first  $1/4$  wavelength plate **721**, the absorption axis of the second polarizer **720** is at  $45^\circ$  from the phase delay axis of the second  $1/4$  wavelength plate **721**, and the phase delay axis of the first  $1/4$  wavelength plate **721** and the phase delay axis of the second  $1/4$  wavelength plate **721** are perpendicular to each other (see e.g. paragraph [0081] and Figure 8).

Given the teachings of Suzuki et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the display device of Andry et al. with a first polarizer and a second polarizer are installed each on one of the outer sides of said pair of substrates so that the absorption axes of the two polarizers are perpendicular to each other; a first  $1/4$  wavelength plate is installed between one of said substrates and the first polarizer; a second  $1/4$  wavelength plate is installed between the other one of said substrates and the second polarizer; and the absorption axis of the first polarizer is at  $45^\circ$  from the phase delay axis of the

first 1/4 wavelength plate, the absorption axis of the second polarizer is at 45° from the phase delay axis of the second 1/4 wavelength plate, and the phase delay axis of the first 1/4 wavelength plate and the phase delay axis of the second 1/4 wavelength plate are perpendicular to each other.

Doing so would provide a means for operating the display device as a switching element and for compensating the effects of the birefringence of the liquid crystal molecules, which may become detrimental to the display quality.

**In regard to claim 2**, Andry et al. discloses said liquid crystal layer has a section **401** obtained by polymerizing a polymerizable compound in the presence of said liquid crystal through selective irradiation of active energy rays over the substrate surface without voltage application (see e.g. Figure 4).

Note that the product by process limitation, “. . . obtained by polymerizing a polymerizable compound in the presence of said liquid crystal through selective irradiation of active energy rays over the substrate surface without voltage application . . .” has been fully considered by the examiner. However, it is further noted that the patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production (see e.g. MPEP 2113).

**In regard to claim 3**, Andry et al. discloses said liquid crystal layer has a section **401** obtained by polymerization through selective irradiation of active energy rays followed by irradiation of active energy rays all over the substrate surface with voltage application (see e.g. Figure 4).

Note that the product by process limitation, “. . . obtained by polymerization through selective irradiation of active energy rays followed by irradiation of active energy rays all over the substrate surface with voltage application . . .” has been fully considered by the examiner.

However, it is further noted that the patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production (see e.g. MPEP 2113).

**In regard to claim 4**, Andry et al. discloses at least one of said two irradiations of active energy rays has been carried out along a direction tilted from the normal to the substrate surface.

Note that the product by process limitation, “. . . at least one of said two irradiations of active energy rays has been carried out along a direction tilted from the normal to the substrate surface . . . ” has been fully considered by the examiner. However, it is further noted that the patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production (see e.g. MPEP 2113).

**In regard to claim 5**, Andry et al. discloses the above limitations, but fails to explicitly disclose said liquid crystal layer shows a specific light shielding pattern caused by the alignment of liquid crystal molecules when a voltage is applied after said irradiation or irradiations of active energy rays.

However, Suzuki et al. discloses said liquid crystal layer **308** shows a specific light shielding pattern caused by the alignment of liquid crystal molecules **308** when a voltage is applied after said irradiation or irradiations of active energy rays (see e.g. Figure 8 and note that the pattern is the result of the molecules moving under an applied electric field in combination with the polarizers sandwiching the cell).

Given the teachings of Suzuki et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the liquid crystal display device of Andry et al. with said liquid crystal layer shows a specific light shielding pattern caused by the alignment of liquid crystal molecules when a voltage is applied after said irradiation or irradiations of active energy rays.

Doing so would provide a means for operating the display device as a switching element and for compensating the effects of the birefringence of the liquid crystal molecules, which may become detrimental to the display quality.

Note that the product by process limitation, “. . . after said irradiation or irradiations of active energy rays . . .” has been fully considered by the examiner. However, it is further noted that the patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production (see e.g. MPEP 2113).

**In regard to claim 6**, Andry et al. discloses is silent as to said pattern caused by the alignment of liquid crystal molecules comprises at least one pattern selected from the group consisting of a lattice pattern, a crisscross pattern, a pattern in the shape of stripes and a pattern in the shape of stripes with bends.

However, Suzuki et al. discloses said pattern caused by the alignment of liquid crystal molecules comprises at least one pattern selected from the group consisting of a lattice pattern, a crisscross pattern, a pattern in the shape of stripes and a pattern in the shape of stripes with bends (see e.g. Figure 8 and note that the pattern is the result of the molecules moving under an applied electric field in combination with the polarizers sandwiching the cell).

Given the teachings of Suzuki et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the display device of Andry et al. with said pattern caused by the alignment of liquid crystal molecules comprises at least one pattern selected from the group consisting of a lattice pattern, a crisscross pattern, a pattern in the shape of stripes and a pattern in the shape of stripes with bends.



Doing so would provide a means for operating the display device as a switching element and for compensating the effects of the birefringence of the liquid crystal molecules, which may become detrimental to the display quality.

**In regard to claim 8**, Andry et al. discloses at least one means selected from the group consisting of protrusions, depressions and a slit pattern in an electrode is installed on the surface or surfaces which contact the liquid crystal (liquid crystal layer contacting surface or surfaces) (see e.g. Figures 4-6).

**In regard to claim 9**, Andry et al. discloses said liquid crystal has negative dielectric constant anisotropy (see e.g. Column 5, lines 12-15), and is aligned in the direction vertical to the substrate surface when no voltage is applied after said irradiation or irradiations of active energy rays (see e.g. Column 7, lines 17-20 and 24-26).

Note that the product by process limitation, “. . . after said irradiation or irradiations of active energy rays . . .” has been fully considered by the examiner. However, it is further noted that the patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production (see e.g. MPEP 2113).

#### **Response to Arguments**

4. Applicant's arguments, see page 2 of the Remarks, filed July 13, 2010, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-6, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of the newly cited reference, Andry et al., as cited above.

### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JESSICA M. MERLIN whose telephone number is (571)270-3207. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 6:30AM-4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Nelms can be reached on (571) 272-1787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jessica M. Merlin  
September 21, 2010

/Jessica M. Merlin/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2871